



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,777	09/04/2003	Chuan-Pei Yu	B-5222 621210-0	8986
36716	7590	06/07/2005		EXAMINER
LADAS & PARRY				HAN, JASON
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100				
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,777	YU ET AL.
	Examiner Jason M. Han	Art Unit 2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/4/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because "A backlight module" is not a complete sentence – please consider deleting. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/613493. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the structural limitations of the claims encompass the same scope, whereby the language/wording is comparable.

4. Claims 11-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/613493. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applications recite similar structural limitations, whereby the current application incorporates a plurality of supports, however, it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With regards to Independent Claim 11, applicant recites the limitation, "a plurality of supports disposed on the reflector in a manner such that the supports are abutted by the diffuser plate, wherein each of the lamps is retained by one of the lamps respectively", whereby the underlined renders an indefinite limitation. Applicant should positively cite and clarify the structure that retains each of lamps respectively. All subsequent dependent claims remain indefinite for the abovementioned reasoning.

The following claims have been rejected in light of the specification, but rendered the broadest interpretation as construed by the examiner [MPEP 2111].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-2, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imoto (U.S. Patent 4826293).
9. With regards to Claim 1, Imoto discloses a backlight module including:
 - A reflector [Figure 9: (12)];
 - A support [Figure 9: (15)] disposed on the reflector;
 - A lamp [Figure 9: (11)] disposed in the support; and
 - A diffuser plate [Figure 9: (19)] disposed on the reflector, wherein a first gap [Figure 9: area defined where the lamp is disposed] with a predetermined size is formed between the support and the diffuser plate so that the diffuser plate is abutted by the support when the support is expanded [Figures 6-7; Column 3, Lines 22-23].
10. With regards to Claim 2, Imoto discloses a fixed portion [Figure 7: (15a)] fixed on the reflector; and a retaining portion [Figure 7: (15b, 15c)] integrally formed with the

fixed portion, wherein the first gap [Figures 7, 9: area defined between the diffuser plate and (15b)] is formed between the retaining portion and the diffuser plate so that the diffuser plate is abutted by the retaining portion when the support is expanded.

11. With regards to Claim 6, Imoto discloses the diffuser plate [Figure 9: (19)] being abutted by the retaining portion in a point contact manner [Figure 7: (15c)].

12. With regards to Claim 8, Imoto discloses a second gap [Figure 7: (15d); Figure 9: (13a)] with a predetermined size is defined between the support and the lamp so as to prevent the lamp from being damaged by the support when the support is deformed.

13. With regards to Claim 10, Imoto discloses the lamp [Figure 9: (11)] being surrounded by the support [Figure 9: (15)].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art pertinent to the current application, but are not considered exhaustive:

JP05119313A to Morita;

US Publication 20020044437 to Lee;

US Publication 20020113924 to Saito et al;

US Patent 6561663 to Adachi et al;

US Publication 20040012971 to Tsai et al;

US Patent 6700554 to Ham et al;

US Patent 6734926 to Fan et al;

US Patent 6747404 to Rha.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Han whose telephone number is (571) 272-2207. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JMH (5/31/2005)

Stephen Husar
Stephen Husar
Primary Examiner